

Insight

The 10 percent or greater owners of Insight Communications Company, Inc. are CVMO Acquisition, LLC, which holds 43 percent of the equity, and The Carlyle Group, which holds 43 percent of the equity through four entities under its control. The 10 percent or greater owners of CVMO Acquisition, LLC are Crestview Partners II, L.P., which holds 47.96 percent of the equity and MidOcean Partners III, L.P., which holds 12.65 percent of the equity. Crestview Partners II is controlled by Crestview Partners, and MidOcean Partners III is controlled by MidOcean Partners. The principal business of each of the listed direct and indirect owners of Insight Communications Company is investments, and each is organized in the United States. The address for CVMO Acquisition, Crestview Partners II and CrestView Partners is 667 Madison Avenue, 10th Floor, New York, New York 10065. The address for MidOcean Partners III and MidOcean Partners is 320 Park Avenue, Suite 1700, New York, New York 10022. The address for The Carlyle Group and the other Carlyle entities is 520 Madison Avenue, 42nd Floor, New York, New York 10022.

- (i) TWC certifies that it is not a foreign carrier in any country, nor is it affiliated with any foreign carrier.
- (j) TWC certifies that it does not seek to provide international telecommunications services to any destination country to which 47 C.F.R. § 63.18(j)(1) through (j)(4) applies.
- (k)-(m) Sections (k) through (m) of 47 C.F.R. § 63.18 are not applicable to TWC because it is not affiliated with any foreign carrier.
- (n) TWC certifies that it has not agreed to accept special concessions directly or indirectly from any foreign carrier with respect to any U.S. international route where the foreign carrier possesses market power on the foreign end of the route and will not enter into such agreements in the future.
- (o) TWC and Insight certify, pursuant to 47 C.F.R. §§ 1.2001 through 1.2003, that no party to this Application is subject to a denial of Federal benefits pursuant to Section 5301 of the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988.
- (p) The Applicants request streamlined processing of this Application to transfer control of Insight's international Section 214 authorization pursuant to 47 C.F.R. § 63.12. TWC is not affiliated with a foreign carrier in a destination market, nor does it have an affiliation with a dominant U.S. carrier whose international switched or private line services it seeks authority to resell.⁹ Therefore, pursuant to section 63.12(a) of the Commission's rules, the

⁹ 47 C.F.R. § 63.12(c).

Commission should grant this Application fourteen days after the date of public notice listing this Application as accepted for filing.

B. Information Required by 47 C.F.R. § 63.04

In accordance with section 63.04(b) of the Commission's rules,¹⁰ which specifies the contents required of joint international and domestic Section 214 transfer of control applications, in addition to the information required in international Section 214 authorizations by 47 C.F.R. § 63.18, the Applicants submit the following information, as described in 47 C.F.R. § 63.04(a)(6) through (a)(12):

(6) Description of the transaction.

The transaction is described at Section I of this Application.

(7) Description of the geographic areas in which the transferor and transferee (and their affiliates) offer domestic telecommunications services, and what services are provided in each area.

The respective services and operating areas of TWC and Insight are as described in Section I above.

(8) Statement as to how the application fits into one or more of the presumptive streamlined categories in this section or why it is otherwise appropriate for streamlined treatment.

This Application satisfies the criteria set forth in Section 63.03(b)(2) for presumptive streamlined processing because: (i) the Applicants have a market share in the interstate interexchange market of less than 10 percent, (ii) the Applicants provide competitive telephone exchange services or exchange access services (if at all) exclusively in geographic areas served by a dominant local exchange carrier that is not a party to the Transaction, and (iii) the

¹⁰ *Id.* § 63.04(b).

Applicants are not dominant with respect to any telecommunications service.¹¹ As the Commission has explained, “[w]here facilities-based carriers proposing to combine are not dominant with respect to any service . . . , it is extremely unlikely that the proposed combination could result in a public interest harm, particularly where their combined market shares are relatively low.”¹² Although the approval of the overall Transaction will be subject to the grant of the Section 652 waiver request, consent to the transfer of control relating to the domestic Section 214 authorization should be processed on a streamlined basis.

(9) Identification of all other Commission applications related to the same transaction.

The Applicants have filed simultaneous applications with the Commission’s Wireless Telecommunications Bureau and International Bureau seeking authority to transfer to TWC control of Insight’s subsidiaries that hold FCC licenses relating to Insight’s cable systems.

(10) Statement of whether the applicants are requesting special consideration because either party to the transaction is facing imminent business failure.

The Applicants are not requesting such special consideration of this Application.

(11) Identification of any separately filed waiver requests being sought in conjunction with the transaction.

The Applicants request a waiver of Section 652(b) of the Act in Section V below. There are no other separately filed waiver requests being sought in connection with the Transaction.

¹¹ *Id.* § 63.03(b)(2); *Implementation of Further Streamlining Measures for Domestic Section 214 Authorizations*, 17 FCC Rcd 5517 ¶ 28 (2002) (“*Streamlining Order*”) (Streamlined treatment is “presumed to apply” when “neither of the applicants is dominant with respect to any service . . . [and] where a transaction would result in a transferee having a market share in the interstate, interexchange market of less than 10 percent, and the transferee would provide competitive telephone exchange services or exchange access services (if at all) exclusively in geographic areas served by a dominant local exchange carrier that is not a party to the transaction.”).

¹² *Streamlining Order* ¶ 30.

(12) Statement showing how grant of the application will serve the public interest, convenience and necessity.

This Application serves the public interest, convenience and necessity, as discussed in Section IV below.

IV. THE TRANSACTION WILL PROMOTE THE PUBLIC INTEREST

As described more fully in the public interest statement accompanying the Applicants' related license transfer applications, the Commission's approval of this Application will serve the public interest, convenience, and necessity. In addition to the general merger synergies and the benefits relating to cable television and broadband Internet access services, the Transaction will strengthen the combined company's ability to compete with dominant incumbent LECs (including, in particular, AT&T) in the provision of voice and data telecommunications services and otherwise will benefit Insight's customers in several different respects.

First, the integration of Insight's voice and data networks with TWC's adjacent facilities will maximize the combined company's ability to compete with the dominant ILEC, AT&T. The combination of these networks will create operating efficiencies as well as scale and scope advantages in procuring key inputs, such as long-distance service, 911 connectivity, and directory assistance and other database services. Whereas Insight operates only within three states, TWC's far broader footprint will create various advantages for the combined company, such as the ability to eliminate redundant facilities and to rely on regional soft switches, gateways, and other network equipment. By lowering the combined company's cost structure and facilitating the delivery of high-quality, innovative services, these network-integration and procurement efficiencies will bolster the company's ability to deliver benefits to its customers and to compete with the dominant ILEC in each service area. Given the massive scale and nationwide reach of AT&T, a leading competitor to Insight, the combination with TWC will be

vital to Insight's ability to compete in market segments for which a broader footprint are advantageous, if not essential, such as enterprise services for companies with operations that extend beyond Insight's current service area. Indeed, the Commission has recognized that increased "clustering" of cable systems translates into competitive benefits for purchasers of voice and data services (in addition to video services).¹³

Second, the Transaction will maximize Insight's ability to harness the efficiencies enabled by Internet Protocol ("IP") technologies and avoid the costs associated with operating different types of networks. The Commission has acknowledged the multifaceted benefits of IP networks—including lower operating costs and innovative features—and thus has affirmatively encouraged carriers to replace traditional circuit-switched networks with IP networks.¹⁴ Insight relies primarily on IP technology in providing voice services to its customers today, but continues to serve more than 73,000 customers using legacy circuit-switched technology.¹⁵

¹³ See, e.g., *Annual Assessment of the Status of Competition in the Market for the Delivery of Video Programming*, Fifth Annual Report, 13 FCC Rcd 24284 ¶ 144 (1998) (noting that "clustering makes cable providers a more effective competitor to LECs whose service areas are usually larger than a single cable franchise area").

¹⁴ See, e.g., *Connect America Fund; A National Broadband Plan for Our Future; Establishing Just and Reasonable Rates for Local Exchange Carriers; High-Cost Universal Service Support; Developing an Unified Intercarrier Compensation Regime; Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service; Lifeline and Link-Up*, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 26 FCC Rcd 4554 ¶¶ 505-06 (2011) (seeking to "encourage carriers to more rapidly deploy broadband facilities and IP based services" through intercarrier compensation and universal service reforms) (internal citations and quotation marks omitted); Omnibus Broadband Initiative, *CONNECTING AMERICA: THE NATIONAL BROADBAND PLAN*, at 49, 59 (2010) (making recommendations to encourage carriers to transition to IP-based networks).

¹⁵ Insight does not offer circuit-switched service to any new customers and is relying on attrition to reduce its base of circuit-switched customers over time.

TWC's voice services, by contrast, consist solely of VoIP, enabling it to operate more efficiently. Therefore, TWC is ideally positioned to assist Insight in expanding its IP-based services.¹⁶

Third, the Transaction will entail particular benefits for medium-sized business and large enterprise customers, as well as wholesale customers including wireless carriers, as a result of TWC's extensive experience with such services and its broad array of service offerings. TWC has robust service options that will enable it to enhance the competitiveness of enterprise and wholesale services available in Insight's service territory. TWC has described its innovative enterprise offerings in prior submissions to the Commission, as well as its backhaul services for wireless providers, both of which offer critical alternatives to incumbent LECs' special access and other services.¹⁷ Moreover, TWC's recent acquisition of NaviSite, a leader in cloud computing services, will create further opportunities for enterprise customers to benefit from an integrated suite of managed services. Just as the integration of NaviSite's cloud-based services with TWC's IP-enabled networks will produce benefits for TWC customers, the Transaction will facilitate the ability of Insight's customers to obtain a wider range of highly reliable, scalable, and customizable service enhancements including Managed Cloud Services, Managed Application Services, Managed Messaging Services, and Enterprise Hosting.¹⁸

¹⁶ TWC has experience in implementing IP-based platforms. *See, e.g.*, Public Notice, *Comments Invited on Application of Time Warner Cable Information Services (Texas), L.P. d/b/a Time Warner Cable to Discontinue Domestic Telecommunications Services*, DA 07-4724, WC Docket No. 07-266 (rel. Nov. 27, 2007) (seeking comment on TWC discontinuance of circuit-switched services previously provided by Adelphia, as part of TWC's transition of affected customers to its VoIP services).

¹⁷ *See, e.g.*, Comments of Time Warner Cable, *Business Broadband Marketplace*, WC Docket No. 10-188 (filed Oct. 15, 2008) (describing High Speed Internet Access, Dedicated Internet Access, Metro Ethernet, and Cell Backhaul, among other services).

¹⁸ *See* NAVISITE, <http://www.navisite.com> (last visited Sept. 1, 2011).

Finally, the Transaction will not diminish competition in any relevant market or otherwise harm the public interest. For purposes of the Commission's analysis under Section 214, the Transaction poses no threat to competition because TWC and Insight generally do not compete in the provision of voice or data services. As discussed further below, the companies' networks overlap to a *de minimis* degree in and around Columbus, Ohio. That overlap consists of approximately 2,600 households, which represent less than 0.2 percent of the more than 1.34 million homes passed by Insight's facilities overall. Insight and TWC's respective networks overlap by only approximately 90 plant miles, which represent approximately 0.55 percent of Insight's roughly 16,500 total plant miles. The fact that the companies overwhelmingly serve separate geographic areas demonstrates that the Transaction will not result in harm to competition or related public interest concerns.¹⁹

V. THE COMMISSION SHOULD GRANT A WAIVER OF THE CABLE-LEC BUYOUT RESTRICTION PURSUANT TO SECTION 652 OF THE ACT

Section 652(b) of the Act generally prohibits a cable operator from acquiring a LEC that provides telephone exchange service within the cable operator's franchise area.²⁰ As explained

¹⁹ See, e.g., *Applications Filed by Frontier Communications Corporation and Verizon Communications Inc. for Assignment or Transfer of Control*, WC Docket 09-95, Memorandum Opinion and Order, FCC 10-87 ¶¶ 15-16 (rel. May 21, 2010) ("Because [the parties] do not currently compete against each other in the transaction market area, the transaction does not appear likely to have adverse effects on existing competition."); see also *Streamlining Order* ¶ 30 (providing for streamlined approval of transactions between non-dominant providers of telecommunications services, even where they do compete, based on the very low likelihood of competitive harm from such transactions).

²⁰ Section 652(b) of the Act states:

No cable operator or affiliate of a cable operator that is owned by, operated by, controlled by, or under common ownership with such cable operator may purchase or otherwise acquire, directly or indirectly, more than a 10 percent financial interest, or any management interest, in any local exchange carrier providing telephone exchange service within such cable operator's franchise area.

47 U.S.C. § 572(b). See also 47 C.F.R. § 76.505(b).

in detail in a pending petition for declaratory ruling filed by the National Cable and Telecommunications Association, the Commission could reasonably interpret Section 652(b) as applying only to covered transactions involving a cable operator and *incumbent* LEC (as opposed to a competitive LEC (“CLEC”), such as the Insight subsidiaries at issue here, that did not provide telephone exchange service as of January 1, 1993).²¹ Although the Applicants believe that such an interpretation would best effectuate Congress’s intent, this Application seeks a waiver under Section 652(d) in the interest of obtaining approval for the proposed Transaction as expeditiously as possible. As set forth below, to the extent that Section 652(b) applies, a waiver is plainly appropriate because the Transaction presents almost no competitive overlap, is strongly pro-competitive, and does not remotely involve the types of concerns that Section 652(b) was enacted to address. The Applicants therefore request that the Commission process this Application on the basis of their waiver request, and accordingly assume that Section 652(b) applies to this Transaction without deciding more generally whether Section 652(b) applies to a cable operator’s acquisition of a CLEC.²²

Under Section 652(d)(6) of the Act, the Commission may waive the buyout restriction in Section 652(b) where “the anticompetitive effects of the proposed transaction are clearly outweighed in the public interest by the probable effect of the transaction in meeting the convenience and needs of the community to be served” and the local franchising authorities

²¹ See generally *Petition for Declaratory Ruling To Clarify 47 U.S.C. § 572 in the Context of Transactions between Competitive Local Exchange Carriers and Cable Operators*, WC Docket No. 11-118 (filed June 21, 2011).

²² In the event the Commission nevertheless chooses to address the broader question of the scope of Section 652(b) in this proceeding—*i.e.*, rather than in the pending declaratory ruling proceeding (WC Docket No. 11-118)—the Applicants request an opportunity to brief the pertinent legal issues in an appropriate filing.

(“LFAs”) in question approve of the waiver.²³ That standard is easily satisfied here. Although Insight provides telephone exchange service in a limited number of areas in which TWC holds a franchise, the Transaction will have no anticompetitive effects, because the two companies generally serve distinct geographic areas and therefore do not compete with one another. Moreover, the Transaction will strongly promote the public interest by enhancing the combined company’s ability to compete with dominant ILECs such as AT&T and delivering additional benefits to consumers.²⁴ Consistent with the Commission’s handling of Comcast’s recent acquisition of CIMCO, a Chicago-based CLEC, the Applicants request that the Commission adopt procedures that (1) enable the relevant LFAs to file comments expressing their approval or disapproval of the Applicants’ waiver request, and (2) deem an LFA to have approved the waiver request if it does not file comments within 60 days of being served with a copy of the Public Notice describing the approval procedure.²⁵

A. The Transaction Will Cause No Anticompetitive Effects

Even assuming Section 652(b) applies to cable-CLEC transactions, the instant Transaction for the most part would trigger that provision only in the highly technical sense that

²³ 47 U.S.C. § 572(d)(6)(A)(iii).

²⁴ See *supra* Section IV (explaining public interest benefits of the Transaction).

²⁵ See Public Notice, *CIMCO Communications, Inc. and Comcast Phone, LLC, Comcast Phone of Michigan, LLC, and Comcast Business Communications, LLC, for the Acquisition of Certain Customers and Assets of an Authorized Domestic and International Carrier*, WC Docket No. 09-183, FCC 09-104 (rel. Dec. 1, 2009) (adopting LFA approval procedures); Public Notice, *Application Filed for the Acquisition of Certain Assets and Authorizations of CIMCO Communications, Inc. by Comcast Phone LLC, Comcast Phone of Michigan, LLC and Comcast Business Communications, LLC*, WC Docket No. 09-183 (rel. Jan. 29, 2010) (clarifying LFA approval procedures); *Applications Filed for the Acquisition of Certain Assets of CIMCO Communications, Inc. by Comcast Phone LLC, Comcast Phone of Michigan, LLC and Comcast Business Communications, LLC*, Memorandum Opinion and Order and Order on Reconsideration, 25 FCC Red 3401 ¶¶ 25-31 (2010) (“*Comcast-CIMCO Order*”) (denying reconsideration and reaffirming validity of “deemed approved” procedure).

Insight provides telephone exchange service in certain areas that TWC is *authorized* to serve, but does not actually serve. TWC and Insight generally do not have overlapping networks or compete with one another despite holding overlapping franchises in certain communities. Thus, while Section 652(b) was intended to prevent the incumbent LEC from acquiring the incumbent cable operator or vice versa in any given area, and thereby gain control of the only two wires into the home, this Transaction does not remotely implicate such concerns about the loss of a major competitor.

The specific facts pertaining to Insight's provision of telephone exchange service in TWC's franchise areas underscore the absence of competitive harm flowing from the Transaction. Of the more than 200 Insight-authorized service areas, there are 26 local franchise areas in Ohio and three in Kentucky in which both TWC and Insight both hold a cable television franchise. Insight serves fewer than 4,000 telephone exchange customers in nine of those overlapping franchise areas. However, the vast majority of those customers reside in areas in which there is no actual overlap between the two companies' *networks*. Rather, subject to the *de minimis* exceptions described below, Insight provides its facilities-based telephone exchange service only within portions of TWC's franchise areas that TWC itself does *not* serve.

As a result, to the extent that Section 652(b) applies at all, it applies despite the absence of overlapping facilities or service offerings. In any event, because TWC and Insight generally do not compete with one another, the Transaction is incapable of diminishing competition. For the same reason, the Transaction plainly does not implicate the concerns that animated the enactment of Section 652. As the Commission has recognized, "Congress' main concern in enacting section 652, as indicated by the legislative history, was to avoid having a LEC purchase

a local cable operator and thus control both wires to consumers.”²⁶ Notwithstanding the fact that the Transaction will not combine a cable operator and an *incumbent* LEC (which means at least two wires invariably will reach every customer), no loss of competition between TWC and Insight as *CLECs* is possible because their facilities generally do not overlap and they therefore did not compete in the first place.

As noted above, TWC’s network does overlap with Insight’s to a very limited degree in and around Columbus, Ohio. Specifically, Insight provides telephone exchange service to 27 residential customers whose homes are passed by TWC’s facilities. Overall, the area in which the companies’ networks overlap consists of approximately 2,600 households, or less than 0.2 percent of Insight’s 1.34 million homes passed, and approximately 90 plant miles (approximately 0.55 percent) out of a total of roughly 16,500 total plant miles in Insight’s network. Such a *de minimis* network overlap has no practical competitive significance when TWC and Insight serve hundreds of thousands of customers over tens of thousands of plant miles in Ohio. Both TWC and Insight are focused on competing against the dominant incumbent LEC and over-the-top VoIP providers in the voice services marketplace; the incumbent LEC likewise represents the dominant player and the competitive focal point with respect to data telecommunications.²⁷

²⁶ *Applications of Ameritech, Corp. & SBC Communications, Inc.*, Memorandum Opinion and Order, 14 FCC Rcd 14712 ¶ 564 n.1081 (1999). See also *US West, Inc.*, Memorandum Opinion and Order, 13 FCC Rcd 4402 ¶ 4 (CSB 1998) (stating that “the premise of Section 652 is that if the LEC and the cable operator within its local markets are not owned by one entity ... there is a greater likelihood of competition as envisioned by the 1996 Act”); Edward J. Markey, *Cable Television Regulation: Promoting Competition in a Rapidly Changing World*, 46 FED. COMM. L.J. 1, 6 (1993) (“One company should not control both the phone and the cable wire running down the street. The goal of congressional action should be to preserve a two-wire, competitive world.”).

²⁷ TWC and Insight similarly compete against incumbent LECs (among other providers, including cable operators and wireless carriers) in the provision of video services and broadband Internet access.

Because the Applicants' networks overlap to such a limited degree, nor is there any meaningful potential for future competition between them.

In short, although the waiver standard set forth in Section 652(d)(6)(A)(iii) presupposes that a covered transaction will harm competition and focuses on whether there are countervailing public interest benefits, the instant Transaction poses no threat to competition in the first place.

B. The Transaction Will Strongly Promote the Public Interest

As set forth in Section IV, *supra*, and in the Public Interest Statement accompanying the Applicants' other license-transfer applications, TWC's acquisition of Insight will be strongly pro-competitive and beneficial for consumers. More relevant here, the Transaction will: facilitate Insight's transition to an all-IP voice network, in furtherance of paramount Commission objectives; enable network integration that results in cost savings and potential service enhancements; and expand the breadth and depth of enterprise and wholesale service offerings available to Insight's customers. Collectively, these synergies will bolster the combined company's ability to compete with dominant ILECs in the provision of voice and data telecommunications and increase consumer welfare.

The Commission recognized that a similar combination of CLEC operations in the Comcast-CIMCO transaction warranted a waiver, because it "promot[ed] facilities-based competition in the medium-sized and enterprise business marketplace."²⁸ There, as here, the combination of competitive telecommunications providers promised to create a more effective competitor to AT&T.²⁹ In fact, the instant Transaction presents a considerably stronger case for granting the requested waiver of Section 652(b), because even though Comcast and CIMCO

²⁸ *Comcast-CIMCO Order* ¶ 22.

²⁹ *Id.* ¶ 38.

focused on different market segments, they did have overlapping business service offerings,³⁰ whereas TWC and Insight effectively do not compete at all. In these circumstances, the public interest benefits associated with the Transaction necessarily outweigh the *de minimis* competitive overlap. Accordingly, the Commission should grant the requested waiver.

C. The Commission Should Adopt the Streamlined LFA Approval Procedures That It Established in the Comcast-CIMCO Transaction

Finally, the Applicants request that the Commission adhere to the procedural rules it adopted in the Comcast-CIMCO proceeding for LFA approvals of the requested waiver. In that proceeding, the Commission held that the term “approval” as used in Section 652(d) is ambiguous, giving the Commission broad discretion to adopt an opt-out approval mechanism.³¹ That mechanism affords LFAs a reasonable opportunity to consider a proposed transaction, while at the same time assuring that “the waiver process established by Congress in section 652(d)(6) [is] not effectively nullified by potential undue delay and uncertainty associated with an open-ended process.”³² The Commission found reasonable the concern that some LFAs “might take no steps to express their view regarding the waiver request, even though they have no objection to the request,” for example because the transaction might “involve[] very few customers in any individual [LFA].”³³

Those considerations apply with equal force here. Although the Transaction, to the extent it implicates Section 652 at all, will require approval of only two LFAs—Henderson County, Kentucky and the Ohio Department of Commerce—there is the same prospect that an LFA might delay its consideration of the Transaction indefinitely and thereby thwart its

³⁰ *Id.* ¶ 33.

³¹ *Id.* ¶ 26.

³² *Id.* ¶ 29.

³³ *Id.*

consummation, even if there is no substantive basis to object. Just as in the Comcast-CIMCO proceeding, there are very few telephone exchange customers in most of the areas in question—and no competitive overlap in most instances—which might prompt an LFA to express no views on the Transaction. Accordingly, requiring affirmative, opt-in approval by each LFA would threaten to nullify the waiver process established by Congress.

Consistent with the Comcast-CIMCO procedures, the Applicants request that the Commission issue a Public Notice providing that the Applicants shall serve a copy thereof on each affected LFA within 10 days of its release. If an LFA fails to inform the Commission of its decision within 60 days of receiving the Public Notice, the Commission should deem that authority to have approved of the proposed waiver of the restrictions in Section 652(b). Moreover, any LFA objecting to the grant of the waiver should be required to explain the reasons for its disapproval.

VI. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the Applicants respectfully submit that the public interest, convenience, and necessity will be served by a grant of this Section 214 Application. The Commission should grant a waiver of the buyout restriction in Section 652(b) to the extent it applies, and it should adopt streamlined procedures for LFA approvals of the waiver.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/

INSIGHT COMMUNICATIONS COMPANY, INC.

Elliot Brecher
Keith Hall
INSIGHT COMMUNICATIONS COMPANY, INC.
810 7th Avenue – 41st Floor
New York, New York 10019

Gary S. Lutzker
J.G. Harrington
DOW LOHNES PLLC
1200 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W., Suite 800
Washington, D.C. 20036

TIME WARNER CABLE INC.

Steven N. Teplitz
Terri B. Natoli
Cristina Pauzé
TIME WARNER CABLE INC.
901 F Street, N.W., Suite 800
Washington, DC 20004

Marc Lawrence-Apfelbaum
Julie P. Laine
TIME WARNER CABLE INC.
60 Columbus Circle
New York, New York 10023

Matthew A. Brill
Elizabeth R. Park
LATHAM & WATKINS LLP
555 11th Street, N.W., Suite 1000
Washington, D.C. 20004

Arthur H. Harding
Seth A. Davidson
EDWARDS ANGELL PALMER &
DODGE, LLP
1255 23rd Street, N.W., Eighth Floor
Washington, DC 20037

Dated: September 6, 2011

EXHIBIT D



License Manager

[FCC](#) > [Wireless](#) > [Licensing](#) > [Online Systems](#) > License ManagerLogged In: 0018384495 ([Log Out](#))[Transfer Control](#) [Reference Copy](#) [FCC 603 Privacy Act](#) ☒ [Return to License Manager - My Applications](#) [Help](#)

Confirmation

Your application has been successfully submitted. Any future reference to this application must be made using the application file number.

File Number	Assignor/Transferor Name	Assignee/Transferee Name	Purpose
#0004843245	Insight Communications Company, Inc.	Time Warner Cable Inc.	TC

[Print Application](#)[Print this Page](#)

Application Fees

File Number	Payment Type Code	Quantity	Subtotal
#0004843245	PATM	1	\$60.00
			Total Due \$60.00

Important Notice:

The U.S. Treasury will reject Credit Card transactions greater than \$99,999.99. This limit includes multiple transactions on the same Credit Card totaling more than this limit in a single day. For transactions greater than \$99,999.99, an alternative method of payment must be used. Payment methods can be found at <http://www.fcc.gov/fees>. Reference: Treasury Bulletin No. 2005-03 (<http://www.fms.treas.gov/tfm/vol1/bull.html>)

The FCC strongly recommends online electronic payment. Payment, on a secure website, by credit card allows for faster processing of an application. Before leaving this page, you must click on the "Continue For Payment Options" button. You must make selection of "Pay By Credit Card" or "View Form 159". If you select "View Form 159" print the Form 159 to accompany any manual payment.

CONTINUE FOR PAYMENT OPTIONS

The Form 159 and accompanying fee **MUST** be received by the Commission within 10 calendar days of filing the application(s). If you are paying manually using FCC Form 159, send the application package to: **Federal Communications Commission, P.O. Box 979097, St. Louis, MO 63197-9000**. If you believe that the calculated fee is incorrect, please call 1-877-480-3201, and select option #2 after the main menu recording.

[View My Applications](#)[FCC](#) | [Wireless](#) | [ULS](#) | [CORES](#) | [Paying Fees](#)[Help](#) | [Tech Support](#)

Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street SW
Washington, DC 20554

Phone: 1-877-480-3201
TTY: 1-717-338-2824
[Submit Help Request](#)

Federal
Communications
Commission

Electronic Form 159

Payment Confirmation

Your transaction has been approved. For your records, please note the following:

AGENCY TRACKING ID:	PGC1999496
AUTHORIZATION NUMBER :	059744
AMOUNT PAID :	\$60.00

PRINT FORM 159

CLOSE

Customer Service

[FCC Fees](#)[Web Policies / Privacy Policy](#)[FCC Home Page](#)

If you have any questions or concerns please contact your licensing system help desk.

Agency Tracking ID:PGC1999496 Authorization

Number:059744

Successful Authorization -- Date Paid: 9/6/11

FILE COPY ONLY!!

READ INSTRUCTIONS CAREFULLY BEFORE PROCEEDING (1) LOCKBOX #979097	FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION REMITTANCE ADVICE FORM 159 PAGE NO 1 OF 1	APPROVED BY OMB 3060-059 SPECIAL USE FCC USE ONLY
SECTION A - Payer Information		
(2) PAYER NAME (if paying by credit card, enter name exactly as it appears on your card) Susan E Anderson		(3) TOTAL AMOUNT PAID (dollars and cents) \$60.00
(4) STREET ADDRESS LINE NO. 1 Dow Lohnes PLLC		
(5) STREET ADDRESS LINE NO. 2 1200 New Hampshire Ave NW Ste 800		
(6) CITY Washington	(7) STATE DC	(8) ZIP CODE 20036
(9) DAYTIME TELEPHONE NUMBER (INCLUDING AREA CODE) 202-7762588		(10) COUNTRY CODE (IF NOT IN U.S.A.) US
FCC REGISTRATION NUMBER (FRN) AND TAX IDENTIFICATION NUMBER (TIN) REQUIRED		
(11) PAYER (FRN) 0015798168		(12) FCC USE ONLY
IF PAYER NAME AND THE APPLICANT NAME ARE DIFFERENT, COMPLETE SECTION B IF MORE THAN ONE APPLICANT, USE CONTINUATION SHEETS (FORM 159-C)		
(13) APPLICANT NAME Time Warner Cable Inc.		
(14) STREET ADDRESS LINE NO. 1 60 Columbus Circle		
(15) STREET ADDRESS LINE NO. 2		
(16) CITY New York	(17) STATE NY	(18) ZIP CODE 10023
(19) DAYTIME TELEPHONE NUMBER (INCLUDING AREA CODE) (212) 364-8482		(20) COUNTRY CODE (IF NOT IN U.S.A.)
FCC REGISTRATION NUMBER (FRN) AND TAX IDENTIFICATION NUMBER (TIN) REQUIRED		
(21) APPLICANT (FRN) 0007556251		(22) FCC USE ONLY
COMPLETE SECTION C FOR EACH SERVICE, IF MORE BOXES ARE NEEDED, USE CONTINUATION SHEET		
(23A) FCC Call Sign/Other ID KWG830	(24A) Payment Type Code(PTC) PATM	(25A) Quantity 1
(26A) Fee Due for (PTC) \$60.00	(27A) Total Fee \$60.00	FCC Use Only
(28A) FCC CODE 1	(29A) FCC CODE 2 0004843245	
(23B) FCC Call Sign/Other ID	(24B) Payment Type Code(PTC)	(25B) Quantity
(26B) Fee Due for (PTC)	(27B) Total Fee	FCC Use Only
(28B) FCC CODE 1	(29B) FCC CODE 2	

Reference Copy Only. Do Not Mail to the FCC as an Application.

Submitted: 09/06/2011 at 14:48:29

File Number: 0004843245

FCC Form 603
Main Form

FCC Wireless Telecommunications Bureau
Application for Assignment of Authorization
or Transfer of Control

Approved by OMB

3060 - 0800

See instructions for
public burden estimate

General Information

1) Application Purpose (Select only one) (TC)	
AA - Assignment of Authorization TC - Transfer of Control	AM - Amendment WD - Withdrawal
NT - Required Notification (For Consummation of an Assignment or Transfer) EX - Request for Extension of Time (To Consummate an Assignment or Transfer)	
2) If this application is for an Amendment (AM) or Withdrawal (WD), enter the File Number of the pending or consented to application currently on file with the FCC.	File Number:
3a) Is this application for Assignment of Authorization or Transfer of Control part of a series of applications involving other wireless license(s) held by the Licensee, affiliates of the Licensee (e.g., parents, subsidiaries, or commonly-controlled entities), or third parties that are not included on this application and for which Commission approval or notification is required?	(Y) <u>Yes</u> <u>No</u>
3b) If the answer to 3a is 'Y', is this filing the lead application?	(N) <u>Yes</u> <u>No</u>
3c) If the answer to 3b is 'N', provide the File Number of the lead application.	File Number: 0004843213
3d) Does this transaction for Assignment of Authorization or Transfer of Control involve the assignment or transfer of non-wireless licenses/authorizations for which Commission approval or notification is required?	(Y) <u>Yes</u> <u>No</u>
4) Are attachments (other than associated schedules) being filed with this application?	(Y) <u>Yes</u> <u>No</u>

Fees and Waivers

5a) Is the Applicant exempt from FCC application fees? If 'Y', attach an exhibit demonstrating how the Applicant is exempt from FCC application fees.	(N) <u>Yes</u> <u>No</u>
5b) Is a waiver/deferral of the FCC application fees being requested and the application fees are not being submitted in conjunction with this application? If 'Y', attach a date-stamped copy of the request for waiver/deferral of the FCC application fees.	(N) <u>Yes</u> <u>No</u>
6a) Does this application include a request for waiver of the Commission's Rules (other than a request for application fee waivers)? If 'Y', attach an exhibit specifying the rule section(s) for which a waiver is being requested and including a justification for the waiver request.	(N) <u>Yes</u> <u>No</u>
6b) If 6a is 'Y', enter the number of rule sections involved.	Number of Rule Sections: _____

Additional Transaction Information

7a) Has this application for Assignment of Authorization or Transfer of Control already occurred?	(N) <u>Yes</u> <u>No</u>
7b) If the response to Item 7a is 'Y', provide the date the event occurred:	(MM/DD/YYYY) _____
8) The Assignment of Authorization or Transfer of Control is:	(X) Voluntary () Involuntary
9a) Is this application a <i>pro forma</i> Assignment of Authorization or Transfer of Control?	(N) <u>Yes</u> <u>No</u>
9b) If Item 9a is 'Y', is this a post-consummation notification that is being filed under the Commission's forbearance procedures pursuant to Section 1.948(c)(1) of the Commission's Rules?	() <u>Yes</u> <u>No</u>
10a) Does this application involve the partitioning and/or disaggregation of geographic-area licenses? If 'Y', complete Schedule B and, if applicable, Schedule C.	() <u>Yes</u> <u>No</u>
10b) If 10a is 'N', does this application involve the partial assignment of site-based licenses?	() <u>Yes</u> <u>No</u>

11) How will/has the Assignment of Authorization or Transfer of Control be/been accomplished? Select One: (T)

Sale or other assignment of assets

Court order

Reorganization or liquidation

Transfer of stock or other ownership interests

Other (voting trust agreement, management contract, etc.): _____

Designated Entity Information (If 12a, 12b or 12c is 'Y', Schedule A is required to be completed.)

12a) Enter 'Y' if this application for Assignment of Authorization or Transfer of Control involve any licenses that were originally granted before April 25, 2006, and that were awarded with bidding credits within the last five years and/or any licenses that were originally granted after April 25, 2006, and that were awarded with bidding credits within the last ten years? Otherwise, enter 'N'. The initial grant date is the date that the license was originally granted by the Commission after an auction, even if the license was acquired in the secondary market. The initial grant date is not the date on which the Commission granted an assignment or transfer of control of the license. If the response to this item is 'Y', the licenses may be subject to the FCC's unjust enrichment rules. See Section 1.2111(d), (e) of the Commission's Rules. If the response to 12a is 'Y', Schedule A must be completed.	() <u>Yes</u> <u>No</u>
12b) Does this application for Assignment of Authorization or Transfer of Control involve any licenses that were originally subject to the Commission's installment payment plan?	() <u>Yes</u> <u>No</u>
12c) Does this application for Assignment of Authorization or Transfer of Control involve any licenses that were originally granted pursuant to closed bidding within the last five years?	() <u>Yes</u> <u>No</u>

Competition Related Information

13) Does this application for Assignment of Authorization or Transfer of Control involve a license(s) that may be used for interconnected mobile voice and/or data services that would, if assigned or transferred, create a geographic overlap with another license(s) in which the Assignee/Transferee already holds direct or indirect interests (of 10 percent or more), either as a Licensee or spectrum lessee/sublessee, and that also could be used to provide interconnected mobile voice and/or data services?	() <u>Yes</u> <u>No</u>
14a) Does the Assignee/Transferee hold direct or indirect interests (of 10 percent or more) in any entity that already has access to 10 MHz or more spectrum in the Cellular Radiotelephone, broadband PCS, or Specialized Mobile Radio (SMR) services through license(s), lease(s), or sublease(s) in the same geographic area?	() <u>Yes</u> <u>No</u>
14b) Would/does this application for Assignment of Authorization or Transfer of Control reduce the number of entities providing service (using spectrum in any of the three services listed in Item 14a) in the affected market(s)?	() <u>Yes</u> <u>No</u>

Broadband Radio Service and Educational Broadband Service Information

15a) Will the requested facilities be used to provide multichannel video programming service?	() <u>Yes</u> <u>No</u>
15b) If 15a is 'Y', does the Assignee/Transferee operate, control or have an attributable interest (as defined in Section 27.1202 of the Commission's Rules) in a cable television system whose franchise area is located within the geographic area of the requested facilities? If 'Y', provide an exhibit explaining how the Assignee/Transferee complies with Section 27.1202 of the Commission's Rules or justifying a waiver of that rule. If a waiver of the Commission's Rule(s) is being requested, 6a must be answered 'Y'.	() <u>Yes</u> <u>No</u>
16) Does the Assignee/Transferee comply with the programming requirements contained in Section 27.1203 of the Commission's Rules? If 'N', provide an exhibit explaining how the Assignee/Transferee complies with Section 27.1203 of the Commission's Rules or justifying a waiver of that rule. If a waiver of the Commission's Rule(s) is being requested, 6a must be answered 'Y'.	() <u>Yes</u> <u>No</u>

Assignor/Licensee Information

17) Assignor/Licensee is a(n): (Select One)					
<input type="checkbox"/> Individual	<input type="checkbox"/> Unincorporated Association	<input type="checkbox"/> Trust	<input type="checkbox"/> Government Entity	<input type="checkbox"/> Corporation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Limited Liability Company
<input type="checkbox"/> General Partnership	<input type="checkbox"/> Limited Partnership	<input type="checkbox"/> Limited Liability Partnership	<input type="checkbox"/> Consortium		
<input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____					
18) FCC Registration Number (FRN): 0003748365					
19) First Name (if individual):		MI:	Last Name:		Suffix:
20) Legal Entity Name (if not an individual): Insight Communications Midwest, LLC					
21) Attention To: Elizabeth M. Grier					
22) P.O. Box:		And /Or	23) Street Address: 810 7th Avenue, 41st Floor		
24) City: New York			25) State: NY	26) Zip Code: 10019	
27) Telephone Number: (917)286-2300			28) Fax Number: (917)286-2301		
29) E-Mail Address: grier.e@insightcom.com					

30) Demographics of Assignor/Licensee (Optional):

Race: <input type="checkbox"/> American Indian or Alaska Native <input type="checkbox"/> Asian <input type="checkbox"/> Black or African-American <input type="checkbox"/> Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander <input type="checkbox"/> White	Ethnicity: <input type="checkbox"/> Hispanic or Latino <input type="checkbox"/> Not Hispanic or Latino	Gender: <input type="checkbox"/> Male <input type="checkbox"/> Female
---	---	--

Assignor/Licensee Contact Representative

31) First Name: Gary		MI: S	Last Name: Lutzker		Suffix: Esq
32) Company Name: Dow Lohnes PLLC					
33) Attention To: Gary S. Lutzker					
34) P.O. Box:		And /Or	35) Street Address: 1200 New Hampshire Ave., NW		
36) City: Washington			37) State: DC	38) Zip Code: 20036	
39) Telephone Number: (202)776-2107			40) Fax Number: (202)776-2222		
41) E-Mail Address: glutzker@dowlohnesh.com					

Transferor Information (for Transfers of Control only)

42) Transferor is a(n): (Select One)			
<input type="checkbox"/> Individual	<input type="checkbox"/> Unincorporated Association	<input type="checkbox"/> Trust	<input type="checkbox"/> Government Entity
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Corporation	<input type="checkbox"/> Limited Liability Company		
<input type="checkbox"/> General Partnership	<input type="checkbox"/> Limited Partnership	<input type="checkbox"/> Limited Liability Partnership	<input type="checkbox"/> Consortium
<input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____			
43) FCC Registration Number (FRN): 0018384495			
44) First Name (if individual):	MI:	Last Name:	Suffix:
45) Legal Entity Name (if not an individual): Insight Communications Company, Inc.			
46) Attention To: Elizabeth M. Grier			
47) P.O. Box:	And /Or	48) Street Address: 810 7th Avenue, 41st Floor	
49) City: New York		50) State: NY	51) Zip Code: 10019
52) Telephone Number: (917)286-2300		53) Fax Number: (917)286-2301	
54) E-Mail Address: grier.e@insightcom.com			

55) Demographics of Transferor (Optional):

Race: <input type="checkbox"/> American Indian or Alaska Native <input type="checkbox"/> Asian <input type="checkbox"/> Black or African-American <input type="checkbox"/> Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander <input type="checkbox"/> White	Ethnicity: <input type="checkbox"/> Hispanic or Latino <input type="checkbox"/> Not Hispanic or Latino	Gender: <input type="checkbox"/> Male <input type="checkbox"/> Female
---	---	--

Transferor Contact Representative

56) First Name: Gary	MI: S	Last Name: Lutzker	Suffix: Esq
57) Company Name: Dow Lohnes PLLC			
58) Attention To: Gary S. Lutzker			
59) P.O. Box:	And /Or	60) Street Address: 1200 New Hampshire Ave., NW	
61) City: Washington		62) State: DC	63) Zip Code: 20036
64) Telephone Number: (202)776-2107		65) Fax Number: (202)776-2222	
66) E-Mail Address: glutzker@dowlohnesh.com			

Assignee/Transferee Information

67) Assignee/Transferee is a(n): (Select One)			
<input type="checkbox"/> Individual	<input type="checkbox"/> Unincorporated Association	<input type="checkbox"/> Trust	<input type="checkbox"/> Government Entity
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Corporation	<input type="checkbox"/> Limited Liability Company		
<input type="checkbox"/> General Partnership	<input type="checkbox"/> Limited Partnership	<input type="checkbox"/> Limited Liability Partnership	<input type="checkbox"/> Consortium
<input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____			
68) FCC Registration Number (FRN): 0007556251			
69) First Name (if individual):	MI:	Last Name:	Suffix:
70) Legal Entity Name (if not an individual): Time Warner Cable Inc.			
71) Attention To: Julie P. Laine, Group VP			
72) Real Party in Interest FCC Registration Number (FRN): 0007556251			
73) Name of Real Party in Interest: Time Warner Cable Inc.			
74) P.O. Box:	And /Or	75) Street Address: 60 Columbus Circle	
76) City: New York	77) State: NY	78) Zip Code: 10023	
79) Telephone Number: (212)364-8482		80) Fax Number: (212)973-6239	
81) E-Mail Address: julie.laine@twcable.com			

82) Demographics of Assignee/Transferee (Optional):

Race: <input type="checkbox"/> American Indian or Alaska Native <input type="checkbox"/> Asian <input type="checkbox"/> Black or African-American <input type="checkbox"/> Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander <input type="checkbox"/> White	Ethnicity: <input type="checkbox"/> Hispanic or Latino <input type="checkbox"/> Not Hispanic or Latino	Gender: <input type="checkbox"/> Male <input type="checkbox"/> Female
---	---	--

Assignee/Transferee Contact Representative (if other than Assignee/Transferee)

83) First Name:	MI:	Last Name:	Suffix:
84) Company Name: Time Warner Cable Inc.			
85) Attention To: Julie P. Laine, Group VP			
86) P.O. Box:	And /Or	87) Street Address: 60 Columbus Circle	
88) City: New York	89) State: NY	90) Zip Code: 10023	
91) Telephone Number: (212)364-8482		92) Fax Number: (212)973-6239	
93) E-Mail Address: julie.laine@twcable.com			

Ownership Disclosure Information

94a) Is the Assignee/Transferee required to file FCC Form 602, Ownership Disclosure Information for the Wireless Telecommunications Services?	(<input type="checkbox"/> N) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
94b) If 94a is 'Y', provide the File Number of the FCC Form 602 that is required to be submitted in conjunction with this application or is already on file with the FCC.	File Number: _____

Alien Ownership Information (If any answer is 'Y', provide an attachment explaining the circumstances)

95) Is the Assignee/Post-transfer Licensee a foreign government or the representative of any foreign government?	(<input type="checkbox"/> N) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
96) Is the Assignee/Post-transfer Licensee an alien or the representative of an alien?	(<input type="checkbox"/> N) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
97) Is the Assignee/Post-transfer Licensee a corporation organized under the laws of any foreign government?	(<input type="checkbox"/> N) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
98) Is the Assignee/Post-transfer Licensee a corporation of which more than one-fifth of the capital stock is owned of record or voted by aliens or their representatives or by a foreign government or representative thereof or by any corporation organized under the laws of a foreign country?	(<input type="checkbox"/> N) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
99a) Is the Assignee/Post-transfer Licensee directly or indirectly controlled by any other corporation of which more than one-fourth of the capital stock is owned of record or voted by aliens, their representatives, or by a foreign government or representative thereof, or by any corporation organized under the laws of a foreign country?	(<input type="checkbox"/> N) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
99b) If 99a is 'Y', has the Assignee/Post-transfer Licensee received a ruling(s) under Section 310(b)(4) of the Communications Act with respect to the same radio service(s) and geographic coverage area(s) involved in this application? If the answer to 99b is 'Y', include in the exhibit required by Item 99a the citation(s) of the declaratory ruling(s) received by the Assignee/Post-transfer Licensee (i.e., DA or FCC Number, FCC Record citation if available, and release date). If 99b is 'N', attach to this filing a date-stamped copy of a request for a foreign ownership ruling pursuant to Section 310(b)(4) of the Communications Act. It is not necessary to file a request for a foreign ownership ruling if the Applicant includes in the exhibit required by Item 99a a showing that the requested license(s) is exempt from the provisions of Section 310(b)(4).	(<input type="checkbox"/>) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

Basic Qualification Information

100) Has the Assignee/Transferee or any party to this application had any FCC station authorization, license or construction permit revoked or had any application for an initial, modification or renewal of FCC station authorization, license, or construction permit denied by the Commission? If 'Y', attach an exhibit explaining the circumstances.	(<input type="checkbox"/> N) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
101) Has the Assignee/Transferee or any party to this application, or any party directly or indirectly controlling the Assignee/Transferee ever been convicted of a felony by any state or federal court? If 'Y', attach an exhibit explaining the circumstances.	(<input type="checkbox"/> N) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
102) Has any court finally adjudged the Assignee/Transferee, or any party directly or indirectly controlling the Assignee/Transferee guilty of unlawfully monopolizing or attempting unlawfully to monopolize radio communication, directly or indirectly, through control of manufacture or sale of radio apparatus, exclusive traffic arrangement, or any other means or unfair methods of competition? If 'Y', attach an exhibit explaining the circumstances.	(<input type="checkbox"/> N) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No